E. JEFFREY GRUBE (SB# 167324) ELIZABETH A. BROWN (SB# 235429) C. YEWLEH CHEE (SB# 281710) jeffgrube@gbgllp.com lisabrown@gbgllp.com yewlehchee@gbgllp.com GRUBE BROWN & GEIDT LLP 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 1150 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 603-5000 Facsimile: (415) 840-7210 Attorneys for Defendant UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.	DISTRICT COLURT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	Case No.
,	DEFENDANT UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURT
	REMOVILE TO LEDERIE COOK!
DOES 1 to 100,	
Defendants.	
	•
Case No.	DEFENDANT UNITED PARCEL SERVICE,
	ELIZABETH A. BROWN (SB# 235429) C. YEWLEH CHEE (SB# 281710) jeffgrube@gbgllp.com lisabrown@gbgllp.com yewlehchee@gbgllp.com GRUBE BROWN & GEIDT LLP 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 1150 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 603-5000 Facsimile: (415) 840-7210 Attorneys for Defendant UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC. UNITED STATES NORTHERN DISTRI CRAIG OGANS, Plaintiff, vs. UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC. AND DOES 1 to 100, Defendants.

INC.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL

1	NOTICE OF REMOVAL	
2	TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, PLAINTIFF, AND HIS ATTORNEYS OF	
4	RECORD:	
5	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Defendant UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.	
6	("UPS") hereby removes this action from the Superior Court of the State of California for the	
7	County of San Francisco to the United States District Court for the Northern District of	
8	California. UPS removes this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(a), and 1446 for the	
9	reasons stated below:	
10	<u>JURISDICTION</u>	
11	1. This action is one over which this Court has original jurisdiction under federal	
12	question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and may be removed to this Court pursuant to	
13	28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), because (a) it is a civil action; and (b) it arises under the laws of the United	
14	States — specifically, the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq.	
15	<u>VENUE</u>	
16	2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because the	
17	Superior Court where the removed case was pending is located within this District.	
18	INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT	
19	3. Assignment to the San Francisco Division or Oakland Division is proper pursuant	
20	to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c) because the Superior Court where the removed case was pending is	
21	located in the County of San Francisco.	
22	BACKGROUND	
23	4. On or about March 6, 2017, Plaintiff Craig Ogans filed a Complaint in the	
24	Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Francisco ("Superior Court")	
25	entitled "Craig Ogans v. United Parcel Service, Inc., and Does 1 to 100," designated as Case No.	
26	CGC-17-557418 (the "Action"). A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Complaint in the Action	
27		
28		

is attached to this filing as Exhibit A.¹ See also Declaration of Elizabeth A. Brown ("Brown Decl.") \P 3, Ex. A.

- 5. In the Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that "defendants violated the Labor Code and Fair Labor Standards Act by not paying the plaintiff all wages owed, not paying overtime, not providing rest and meal breaks, and not providing accurate, itemized wage statements." Compl. ¶ 3. See also id. ¶ 15 ("Since Defendants did not pay all compensation owed, Plaintiff is entitled to all remedies under the FLSA."); id. ¶ 19 ("Defendants unlawfully did not pay the plaintiff/employee all wages owed as required by Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 and Wage Order 9.").
- 6. Based on these allegations, Plaintiff brings the following purported causes of action: (1) violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, (2) wage and hour violation, (3) wage statement penalty, (4) waiting time penalty, (5) meal and rest break violation, and (6) unfair competition.
- 7. On March 29, 2017, Plaintiff served the Summons and Complaint on UPS. *See* Brown Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. B.
- 8. Defendants Does 1 to 100 are unnamed and unknown, and therefore have not been served with the Complaint. *See* Compl. ¶ 5.
- 9. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), the undersigned counsel certifies that a copy of this Notice of Removal and all supporting papers will be promptly served on Plaintiff's counsel and filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court.
- 10. This Notice of Removal is effected properly and timely pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

THE COURT HAS FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION OVER THIS ACTION

11. Plaintiff alleges claims arising under the FLSA. Accordingly, original federal question jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because federal law creates the cause of

- 2 -

¹ In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), the Complaint, and all other publicly-available process, pleadings, or orders that were served on UPS in this action also are attached to this Notice as Exhibit A.

1

action. See Breuer v. Jim's Concrete of Brevard, Inc., 538 U.S. 691, 694 (2003) (holding actions brought pursuant to the FLSA can be removed to federal court and affirming denial of plaintiff's motion to remand) ("The FLSA provides that an action 'may be maintained . . . in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction,' 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and the district courts would in any event have original jurisdiction over FLSA claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as 'arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States,' and § 1337(a), as 'arising under any Act of Congress regulating commerce.'").

12. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's remaining state statutory claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Plaintiff's federal and state claims "derive from a common nucleus of operative fact" – namely, UPS's alleged failure to pay all compensation owed. See United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 725 (1966). The state law claims therefore "form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution," giving the Court supplemental jurisdiction over them. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). See also Lindsay v. Gov't Employees Ins. Co., 448 F.3d 416, 424 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (holding district court could exercise supplemental jurisdiction in action alleging violations of the FLSA and New York Minimum Wage Act) ("Here, the complaint alleged that members of both classes performed the same type of work for the same employer and were deprived of overtime compensation as a result of the same action taken by their employer. It is clear to us that the two claims 'derive from a common nucleus of operative fact' and thus form part of the same Article III case or controversy.") (citation omitted); Havel v. SunAmerica Sec., Inc., No. C 06-4543 PJH, 2006 WL 2917591, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2006) (Hamilton, J.) (denying motion to remand where plaintiff asserted two unfair competition causes of actions based on FLSA overtime and California Labor Code violations and nine causes of action under the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Orders for failure to pay minimum wage and overtime, and failure to provide accurate wage statements, adequate meal periods, and adequate rest periods). ///

27 ///

26

28 | ///

1	WHEREFORE, UPS hereby removes the above action now pending before the Superior	
2	Court of California for the County of San Francisco to this Court.	
3		
4	DATED: April 28, 2017	GRUBE BROWN & GEIDT LLP
5		
6		BY: /s/ Elizabeth A. Brown
7		ELIZABETH A. BROWN
8		Attorneys for Defendant UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		